



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/761,938	01/17/2001	James E. Pherson	PD99-2831	5538
7590	12/22/2004		EXAMINER	
William J. Kubida, Esq. Hogan & Hartson, LLP Suite 1500 1200 17th Street Denver, CO 80202			SHERKAT, AREZOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/761,938	PHERSON ET AL.
	Examiner Arezoo Sherkat	Art Unit 2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/17/2001.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hubis et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,324 and Hubis hereinafter), in view of Peters et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,336 and Peters hereinafter).

Regarding claim 1, Hubis discloses a method for implementing security management in a storage area network including at least one storage resource user, a resource provider, and resources controlled by the resource provider, the method comprising the steps of:

requesting access to the resources by sending identifying indicia from the storage resource user to the resource provider, in response to receiving the notification, and examining a table of approved entities for the identifying indicia to determine whether any resources are available to the requesting storage resource user, wherein, if the resources are determined to be available to the storage resource

user requesting access to the resources, then allowing the storage resource user to access the resources(Col. 10, lines 64-67 and Col. 11-13, lines 1-67).

Hubis does not expressly disclose providing notification to the storage resource user that a resource provider is available on the storage area network.

However, Peters discloses providing notification to the storage resource user that a resource provider is available on the storage area network (Col. 20, lines 60-67 and Col. 21, lines 1-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hubis with the teachings of Peters because it would allow to include providing notification to the storage resource user that a resource provider is available on the storage area network with the motivation to provide for a method to verify availability of storage units in the system (Peters, Col. 21, lines 1-65).

Regarding claims 2, 12, and 19, Hubis discloses a method for implementing security management in a storage area network including at least one storage resource user, an data storage RAID controller, and a data storage array coupled to the controller, the method comprising the steps of:

granting access to data storage areas on disks in the storage array to specific storage resource users of the at least one storage resource user, storing, in a table of approved entities in non-volatile memory in the controller, indicia of data storage areas on disks in the storage array accessible to any storage resource user that has

been granted access to data storage areas on disks in the storage array, storing, in a table of not-yet-approved entities in volatile memory in the controller, indicia of any of the at least one storage resource user that have not been granted access to data storage areas on disks in the storage array, requesting access to the areas by sending at least the identifying indicia from the storage resource user to the resource provider, and examining the table of approved entities for the identifying indicia to determine whether any of the data storage areas are available to the requesting storage resource user, wherein, if the data storage areas are determined to be available to the storage resource user requesting access to the data storage areas, then allowing the storage resource user to access the data storage areas, otherwise, if no the data storage areas are determined to be available to the requesting storage resource user, then storing the identifying indicia in the table of not-yet-approved entities (Col. 10, lines 64-67 and Col. 11-13, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 3-4, 6, and 16, Hubis discloses wherein the resource provider comprises an RAID controller (Col. 4, lines 40-67 and Col. 5, lines 1-11).

Regarding claims 5, 7, and 13, Hubis discloses wherein a table of not-yet-approved entities comprising a node World Wide Name and a port World Wide Name for a plurality of storage resource users is stored in volatile memory in the controller (Col. 9, lines 45-67 and Col. 10, lines 1-64).

Regarding claims 8, 9, and 15, Hubis discloses further comprising the steps of: uploading a list of available resources from the resource provider to a management station, uploading the table of not-yet-approved entities from the resource provider to the management station, selecting a storage resource user identity from the table of not-yet-approved entities, selecting, from the list of available resources, resources to be made available to the storage resource user, sending a list of the resources selected and storage resource user identity to the resource provider, allocating, to the storage resource user, the resources included in the list, and presenting, to the storage resource user, the resources allocated in the allocating step (i.e., In state 82, the presence of this storage unit in list 70 is verified. If the storage unit is in the list 70, the count 76 for the storage unit is reset, other information about the storage unit may be updated, and a transition back to state 80 occurs. For example, when indicating that a storage unit is active, the storage unit also may indicate whether it has free space for storage or whether it is full or near capacity)(Col. 21, lines 20-65).

Regarding claims 10-11, 17-18, and 20, Hubis discloses including storing the resources to be made available to the storage resource user in a LUN access map in the table of approved entities (Col. 11, lines 30-67 and Col. 113, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 14, Hubis does not expressly disclose including the step of providing notification to the storage resource user that a resource is available on the storage area network.

However, Peters discloses including the step of providing notification to the storage resource user that a resource is available on the storage area network (Col. 20, lines 60-67 and Col. 21, lines 1-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Hubis with the teachings of Peters because it would allow to include providing notification to the storage resource user that a resource provider is available on the storage area network with the motivation to provide for a method to verify availability of storage units in the system (Peters, Col. 21, lines 1-65).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fujibayashi et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,646).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. Sherkat

Arezoo Sherkat
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131
Dec. 6, 2004

AS
AU2131
12/6/04